

### **REMARKS**

In the above-mentioned Office Action, a restriction requirement was entered, requiring the Applicant to elect for prosecution the claims identified by the Examiner as being of Group I, claims 1-21 and 25, and Group II, claims 22-25. The undersigned affirms the election of the claims of Group I for continued prosecution. Claims 22-24 are withdrawn from consideration, as set forth herein in the listing of claims.

All of the claims identified to be part of Group I were rejected. Claims 1, 15-17, 20, 21, and 25, were rejected under Section 102(b) over *Vazvan*. Claims 1-5, 13, and 14 were separately also rejected under Section 102(e) over *Yu*. Further, claims 1, 7-10, and 19 were further separately rejected under Section 102(e) over *Venigalla*. Claims 1, 6, 11, and 12 were additionally separately rejected under Section 102(e) over *Nel*. And, claim 18 was rejected under Section 103(a) over the combination of *Vazvan* and *Chan*. Claim 25 was rejected under Section 112, second paragraph for indefiniteness. Objection was also made to claims 1, 8, and 14 for the recitation of informalities. And, objection was made to Figure 3 of the drawings, for informalities on pages 10, 11, and 13 of the specification. The Applicant was also advised to capitalize trademarks identified in the application and accompanying the trademarks with generic terminology.

In response to the rejections of the claims, claims 1 and 25 have been amended, as set forth herein, in manners believed to distinguish better the invention of the present application over the references cited against the claims, taken alone or in any combination.

With respect to exemplary claim 1, the claim has been amended, now to recite the operation of downloading to user equipment additional information that associates with a transaction based on information of an object. Claim 25 has been analogously amended, now to recite a control means that is adapted to download additional information based on information of an object.

None of the references cited against the claims disclose the methodology or structure, recited as now-amended. Support for the proposed amendments is found, for instance, on page 10, lines 22-24, and page 11, line 3.

*Yu* appears to be directed towards the tracing of a shopping path of a consumer. Prior to, or subsequent to, a purchase is made from a website, a link is provided to return to the page on which information about the purchase is displayed. The need to page-back through numerous previously-viewed pages is obviated. The Applicant notes that the additional information comprises a previously-viewed page. Hence, there is no downloading of additional information in contrast to the invention, as now-recited. That is to say, *Yu* provides merely for re-viewing of a previously downloaded page. And, therefore, *Yu* fails to disclose the invention, as now-recited.

*Nel* also fails to disclose the methodology or structure of the method, as now-recited. *Nel* appears to be directed towards the performing of interactive data exchanges as part of a transaction. In an example set forth in the reference, a user of a remote terminal makes a transaction with another party. However, downloading of additional information is not disclosed in the reference. Column 6, lines 22-24, for instance, of *Nel*, fails to make any disclosure as to the manner by which products are obtained.

*Vazvan* also fails to disclose the methodology or structure of the present invention, as now-recited. The reference appears to be directed towards remote purchases and bill payments. While the reference appears to describe a method of carrying out a transaction between a user terminal and a remote terminal, the Applicant traverses the Examiner's reliance upon the disclosure of the generated "data entity". Further, the Applicant traverses the Examiner's reliance upon *Vazvan* for showing "information of an object". The information is not an object which associates with the transaction, as recited in the claims of the present invention, but rather is just information that the user would provide to the remote terminal. Consequently, with respect to claim 1, as now-amended, *Vazvan* fails to disclose the operation of "downloading to the user equipment additional information that associates... based on said information of the object."

*Venigalla* also fails to disclose the methodology and structure of the present invention, recited as now-amended. The reference appears to be directed towards a manner for enabling a machine-to-machine communication using XML in order to permit electronic commerce, see,

downloading to the user equipment of additional information based on an object.

As none of the cited references disclose the methodology or structure as set forth in claims 1 and 25, as now-amended, these claims are believed to be distinguishable over the cited references, taken alone, or combined in any combination.

Claim 25 has further been amended in manners believed to overcome the Section 112, second paragraph, rejection thereof. The claim has been amended now to recite a communication mechanism means for communicating with a remote unit to be provided with a data entity transmitted to the mobile user equipment by a remote unit. Support for this recitation is found in the specification, for example, on page 3, line 32 – page 4, line 14, page 9, lines 26-29, page 10, lines 1-3, page 12, lines 18-25, and page 13, lines 1-9. As the recitation finds support throughout the specification of the application, as now-amended, the claim is believed to recite structure in conformity with the requirements of Section 112, second paragraph.

New apparatus claim 26 is further proposed herein. Claim 26 recites structure, including a communication means that transmits a data entity including transaction data and information of an object associated with the transaction. This claim is believed to be distinguishable over the cited references for the same reasons as those given with respect to claims 1 and 25.

Additional amendments to the specification, to the drawings, and to claims 1, 8, and 14 are made to overcome the Examiner's objections thereto.

Additionally, with respect to dependent claims 2-21 that include all of the limitations of their parent claims, these claims are believed to be patentably distinguishable over the cited references for the same reasons as those given with respect to their parent claims.


In light of the foregoing, accordingly, claims 1, 25, and 26, and dependent claims 2-21, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reexamination of the claims and reconsideration for their allowance is respectfully requested. Such early action is earnestly solicited.

Application No 10/083,432  
Amendment dated 02 August 2005  
Reply to Office Action of 02 May 2005

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 2, 2005

SCHEEF & STONE, L.L.P.  
5956 Sherry Lane, Suite 1400  
Dallas, Texas 75225  
Telephone: (214) 706-4200  
Fax: (214) 706-4242  
[robert.kelly@scheefandstone.com](mailto:robert.kelly@scheefandstone.com)

  
Robert H. Kelly  
Reg. No. 33,922

Application No 10/083,432  
Amendment dated 02 August 2005  
Reply to Office Action of 02 May 2005

**Amendments to the drawings:**

Please replace Figures 1 and 4 with the Replacement Sheets of amended Figures 1 and 4.

Attachments: Annotated Sheets Showing Changes Figures 1 and 4.

Replacement Sheets of Figures 1 and 4.





Fig. 3




Fig. 4